



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,811	12/29/2000	Robert E. Gleichauf	062891.0462	8466
5073	7590	04/12/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				MOORTHY, ARAVIND K
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2131		

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/751,811	Applicant(s)	GLEICHAUF, ROBERT E.
Examiner	Aravind K. Moorthy	Art Unit	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the arguments filed on 2 February 2006.
2. Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-39 have been rejected.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2 February 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 16, the applicant argues that independent claim 1 is allowable because Ault fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, "initiating a service request message by a first client to a first server, the service request message initiated after a telephony call session has been established between the first client and a communication network".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ault teaches the client sending messages to the server by making remote calls to the server.

On page 17, the applicant argues that claim 2 is also allowable because Ault fails to disclose the services comprising an application operable to provide text viewing and modification capabilities.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ault teaches a browser through which a request message is sent. The request message includes the URL. The examiner asserts that the URL is text entered by the client and can be modified based on a request.

On page 18, the applicant argues that claim 12 is also allowable because Ault fails to disclose pressing a button associated with the requested service at the first client during the telephony call session to initiate the service request message.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that some sort of button has to be pushed on a browser to send a request message with a URL included. There is no other way a message can be conveyed by a client.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-6, 12, 14, 16-20, 22, 27, 29-31, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ault et al U.S. Patent No. 5,974,566.

As to claims 1, 29 and 36, Ault et al discloses a method for real-time insertion of services during a telephony call session over a communication network, comprising:

- initiating a service request message by a first client to a first server, the service request message initiated after a telephony call session has been established between the first client and a communication network the service request message including the first client identity and a requested service available from a second server comprising a plurality of services [column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 20];
- determining that the first client is authorized to use the requested service at the first server [column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 20];
- and delivering the requested service to the first client during the established telephony call session by the second server in response to determining

that the first client is authorized to use the requested service [column 5, lines 47-65].

As to claims 2 and 17, Ault et al discloses that at least one of the services comprises an application operable to provide text viewing and modification capabilities [column 4, lines 45-65].

As to claims 3 and 18, Ault et al discloses that at least one of the services comprises an application operable to provide graphic viewing and modification capabilities [column 4, lines 45-65].

As to claims 4 and 19, Ault et al discloses that the requested service is only available during the telephony call session [column 5, lines 39-46].

As to claims 5, 20 and 30, Ault et al discloses the method further comprising:

- comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the first server, the list comprising a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of the services available from the second server [column 5 line 66 to column 6 line 48];

- and issuing a ticket to the first client if the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service [column 5, lines 47-65].

As to claims 6, 31 and 37, Ault et al discloses the method further comprising:

- comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the first server, the list comprising a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of the services available from the second server [column 5, lines 47-65];

- issuing a ticket to the first client in response to determining that the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service, the ticket including the first client identity and the requested service; sending the ticket to the second server by the first client [column 5, lines 47-65];
- and reading the ticket at the second server to retrieve the requested service [column 5, lines 47-65].

As to claims 12 and 27, Ault et al suggests pressing a button associated with the requested service at the first client during a telephony call session to initiate the service request message [column 8 line 55 to column 9 line 7].

As to claim 14, Ault et al discloses a communication system, comprising:

- establish a telephony call session between the client and a communication network [column 3, lines 51-61]; and
- initiate a service request message after the telephony call session has been established, the service request message including a client identifier and a requested service to be inserted into the telephony call session;
- a first device operable to couple to the communication network, the first device comprising a list of clients authorized to use at least one of a plurality of services [column 5, lines 29-46];
- and a second device operable to couple to the communication network, the second device further operable to insert the requested service into the established telephony call session in response to determining that the list includes the client identifier and the requested service [column 5, lines 47-58].

As to claim 16, Ault et al discloses that the first device is operable to determine that the client is authorized to use the requested service [column 7, lines 11-39].

As to claim 22, Ault et al suggest that the communication system further comprises:

- a plurality of remote clients coupled to the communication network [column 4, lines 3-25];
- and a plurality of remote second devices coupled to the communication network, each remote second device associated with at least one of the remote clients [column 4, lines 26-44].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-11, 21, 23-26, 32-35, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ault et al U.S. Patent No. 5,974,566 as applied to claims 1, 14, 29 and 36 above, and further in view of Bittinger et al U.S. Patent No. 5,974,566.

As to claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 21, 23-26, 32, 33, 35, 38 and 39, Ault et al teaches comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the first server. Ault et al teaches that the list comprises a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of the services available from the second server. Ault et al teaches issuing a ticket to the first client in response to determining that the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service. Ault et al teaches that the ticket includes the first client identity and the requested service.

Ault et al does not teach sending the ticket and an address associated with a second client to the second server by the first client. Ault et al does not teach reading the ticket at the second server to retrieve the requested service for a second client. Ault et al does not teach delivering the requested service to the second client based on the address received from the first client.

Bittinger et al teaches sending the ticket and an address associated with a second client to the second server by the first client. Bittinger et al teaches reading the ticket at the second server to retrieve the requested service for a second client. Bittinger et al teaches delivering the requested service to the second client based on the address received from the first client [column 7, lines 1-49].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ault et al so that the ticket sent from the first client to the second server included the address associated with a second client. The second server would have read the ticket and retrieved the requested service. The service would have been delivered to the second client based on address received from the first client.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ault et al by the teaching of Bittinger et al because by moving a server-side registry to a computer hosting a client application (i.e., a "client-side" registry), a server application can notify a client application when server application startup processing is complete and can provide a server stub associated with the server application to the client application. As a result, a client application can be automatically notified that a server application is ready to receive client application requests. Consequently, the need for server polling may be eliminated [column 3 line 65 to column 4 line 7].

As to claims 9 and 34, Ault et al teaches comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the first server. Ault et al teaches that the list comprises a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of the services available from the second server [column 5, lines 47-58]. Ault et al teaches issuing a ticket to the second server in response to determining that the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service [column 7, lines 24-40].

7. Claims 13 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ault et al U.S. Patent No. 5,974,566 as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Lancaster et al U.S. Patent No. 5,854,894.

As to claims 13 and 28, Ault et al does not teach selecting the requested service from a menu displayed on the first client during the telephony call session to initiate the service request message.

Lancaster et al teaches selecting a requested service from a menu displayed on the first client during a telephony call session to initiate the service request message [column 2, lines 12-18].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ault et al so that client selected the desired service from a service menu display to initiate the service request message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ault et al by the teaching of Lancaster et al because a menu provides a means for a client to know what services are available by a second server.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(x) as being unpatentable over Ault et al U.S. Patent No. 5,974,566 as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Berbec et al U.S. Patent No. 6,122,631.

As to claim 15, Ault et al does not teach that the client further comprises a cache operable to store a requested service and the requested service removable from the cache when the telephony call session terminates.

Berbek et al teaches a client that comprises a cache operable to store a requested service and the requested service removable from the cache when the telephony call session terminates [column 5, lines 19-27].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ault et al so that client would have stored the requested service in cache and would have removed the requested service from cache when the telephony call session terminated.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ault et al by the teaching of Berbec et al because this allows the client to access files dynamically and allow the server to distribute files in a secure manner [column 1, lines 47-61].

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aravind K Moorthy *AM*
April 6, 2006

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

04/09/06